

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis. Claims 1-3, and 5-17 have been rejected. Applicant requests reconsideration of the final rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 have been rejected as being anticipated by Eto et al. (U.S. 5,411,385). Claim 1 requires an inlet orifice, an outlet orifice and a choke orifice in series with the inlet orifice. The Eto et al. reference does not disclose a choke orifice in series with an inlet orifice. Instead, Figure 1 of Eto et al. discloses orifice portions "Of" and "Or", but no choke orifice. The claim requires a choke orifice that is disposed in series with an inlet orifice. Figure 1 of Eto et al. discloses only the two orifice portions "Of" and "Or", but not a third orifice disposed in series with one of the two orifice portions "Of" and "Or" as is required by claim 1. The Eto et al. references also includes Figure 3 that discloses one orifice "Of" disposed in one of the passages. This embodiment of Eto et al. does not disclose the required inlet orifice, outlet orifice and a choke orifice and therefore cannot anticipate the limitations of claim 1. For these reasons, Eto et al. cannot anticipate the limitations of claim 1. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 6, and 9-13 were rejected as being obvious over Eto et al. in view of Libis (U.S. 4,173,440). Claim 6 depends from claim 1 that is allowable for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. Claims 9 and 12 both require an inlet orifice, an outlet orifice and a choke orifice in series with the inlet orifice for controlling the flow of lubricant to the inlet orifice relative to the flow of lubricant to the outlet orifice. All that Eto et al. discloses are two identical orifice portions "Of" and "Or" but does not disclose the required choke orifice in series with an inlet orifice. Libis is included to disclose a screw compressor. The combination with Libis does not disclose or suggest the missing limitations. Accordingly, as the combination does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 9 and 12, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 7 was rejected as being obvious over Eto et al. in view of Williams (U.S. 3,260,444). Claims 15,16, and 17 were rejected as being obvious over Eto et al. in view of Libis. As discussed above, each of these claims depend ultimately from a base claim that requires an inlet orifice, an outlet orifice and a choke orifice in series with the inlet orifice. Eto et al. does not disclose or suggest these features for the reasons discussed above. The proposed combination

does not disclose or suggest these missing features. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Accordingly, the claims are believed in condition for allowance. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 03-0835, in the name of Carrier Corporation, for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/John M. Siragusa/

John M. Siragusa
Registration No. 46,174
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
Telephone: (248) 988-8360
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: October 8, 2007